



s department of commerce

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NA	MED INVENTOR	A	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/778,973	02/06/01	GOEDEL		J	12570.1USC1
				E	XAMINER
023552		PM82/092	24		
MERCHANT &	GOULD PC			SWINEHA	RT-E
P.O. BOX 29	03			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS	MN 55402-0	903		_	~7
				3617	8
				DATE MAILED:	<i>V</i>
					09/24/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

·		
&	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet	beneath the correspondence address
Period for Reply	2	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	T TO EXPIRE	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defa Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by second contents. 	a reply within the statutory min ult, expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr	imum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication .
Status	1.	
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	6	•
This action is FINAL.	1	
 Since this application is in condition for allowance exce accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1 		
Disposition of Claims		·
Claim(s) 26-29	is/are pending in the application.	
Of the above claim(s)		
□ Claim(s)		is/are allowed.
Claim(s) 26-29		is/are rejected.
☐ Claim(s)		
— -		
☐ Claim(s)		requirement.
		requirement.
Application Papers		requirement.
Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drav	ving Review, PTO-948.	·
Application Papers	ving Review, PTO-948. is □ approved	I □ disapproved.
Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drav ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	ving Review, PTO-948. is □ approved	I □ disapproved.
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drav The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob	ving Review, PTO-948. is □ approved jected to by the Examiner	I □ disapproved.
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drav The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	ving Review, PTO-948. is □ approved jected to by the Examiner	I □ disapproved.
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drave The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob is/are ob is/are ob The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies received.	ving Review, PTO-948 is	l □ disapproved. a)-(d). have been
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draven The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob is/are ob The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies	ving Review, PTO-948. is approved pected to by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a of the priority documents)	l □ disapproved. a)-(d). have been
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dravent The proposed drawing correction, filed on	wing Review, PTO-948. is	disapproved. a)-(d). have been Rule 1 7.2(a)).
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drave The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies received. received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nur received in this national stage application from the *Certified copies not received:	wing Review, PTO-948. is	disapproved. a)-(d). have been Rule 1 7.2(a)).
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drave The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority	ving Review, PTO-948. is approved pected to by the Examiner v under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a of the priority documents mber) International Bureau (PC)	disapproved. a)-(d). have been Rule 1 7.2(a)).
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draven The proposed drawing correction, filed on	ving Review, PTO-948. is approved approved jected to by the Examiner of under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a of the priority documents of the priority document	a)-(d). have been Rule 1 7.2(a)).

Art Unit: 3617

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 26 and 28 are improper Markush type claims, in that since the claimed elements of the group fail to "share a common utility" and fail "to share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility".

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Severence et al. in view of Murayama et al.

Severence et al. teaches the field of the invention, including a pair of phosphorescent bulbs/caps 22. Severence et al. fails to disclose the claimed material.

Murayama et al. teaches such a material, and further teaches application to buoys.

Application/Control Number: 09/778,973

Art Unit: 3617

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the caps of Severence et al. from a phosphorescent material as that taught by Murayama et al.

Such a combination would have been desirable at the time of the invention was made so as to provide for a buoy which will glow a substantial amount of time in the dark.

- 4. Papers relating to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 3600 by facsimile transmission. The submission of such papers by facsimile transmission must comply with the notice published in the Official Gazette, **1096 OG 30** (November 15, 1989). The Fax Center number is (703)-305-7687.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ed L. Swinehart whose telephone number is (703)-308-2566.
- 6. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-308-1113.

September 19, 2001

Ed L. Swinehart Primary Examiner Art Unit 3617